



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,547	09/27/2000	Seshadri Sathyanarayan	042390.P9328	8296
7590 01/10/2008 Kurt P Leyendecker Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 7th Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MERILYN P	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/671,547	SATHYANARAYAN, SESHADRI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Merilyn P. Nguyen	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26-55 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 56-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed action</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the communication dated 10/09/2007, claims 26-72 are active in this application.

Appeal Brief

2. In view of the appeal brief filed on 10/09/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The options set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2163

3. Claims 56-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kravets (US 6,363,377), as set forth in the previous office action mailed 01/26/2005, and reiterated herein below for convenience.

Regarding claims 56 and 63, Kravets discloses a method and a machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

- ❖ transmitting an initial search query from a computer to a remote site over a network (See Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 23-30);
- ❖ receiving a search result document at the computer from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries obtained in response to the initial search query (28, Fig. 1A, and Figs. 3 and 4, and col. 4, lines 17-22, and col. 5, lines 42-64, Kravets et al.);
- ❖ accessing pages at the remote sites from the computer, the accessed pages being associated with at least some of the search result entries (See col. 5, line 65 to col. 7, line 3, Kravets et al.);
- ❖ filtering the search result entries at the computer (See col. 7, lines 66- 67) by comparing information from the accessed pages to the initial query (See col. 7, lines 38-67); and
- ❖ selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison (See col. 8, lines 9-16).

Regarding claim 67, Kravets discloses an apparatus comprising:

Art Unit: 2163

- ❖ a query engine (See Fig. 3) to transmit initial search query from a computer to a remote site over a network (See col. 4, lines 23-30); and
- ❖ a results filter (See Fig. 2B) to receive a search result document from the remote site in response to the initial search query, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results filter further to access pages associated with at least some of the search result entries, to filter the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the initial search query, and to select a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison as addressed above in claim 56.

Regarding claim 70, Kravets discloses a computer system comprising:

- ❖ a processor (See Fig. 2B, and corresponding text);
- ❖ a network connection (See Fig. 1B);
- ❖ a query engine to transmit using the network connection initial search queries to search engines at remote Internet sites as addressed above in claim 67; and
- ❖ a results filter to receive search result documents over the network connection from the remote search engines in response to the initial search queries, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results filter further to access pages associated with at least some of the search result entries, to filter the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the initial search queries, and to select a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison as addressed above in claim 67.

Regarding claims 57, 64, 68, and 71, Kravets discloses at least some of the information from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective search result entry (See col. 8, lines 9-16), the method further comprising parsing hypertext links into constituent elements (See col. 5, lines 55-64), and comparing the hypertext link constituent elements to elements of the initial search query (See col. 6, lines 46-63 and col. 7, lines 38-43).

Regarding claims 58 and 65, Kravets discloses selecting a subset of the search result entries comprises selecting using the comparison of information from accessed pages and the comparison of hypertext link constituent elements (See col. 7, line 44 to col. 8, line 29).

Regarding claims 59, 66, 69, and 72, Kravets discloses at least some of the search result entries include a description of an associated document (See col. 8, lines 18-21), the method further comprising parsing at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements (See col. 5, lines 55-64)¹, and comparing the description constituent elements to elements of the initial search query (See col. 8, lines 21-25) and wherein selecting a subset comprises selecting a subset using the description constituent elements comparison (See col. 8, lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 60, Kravets discloses generating a summary document comprised of the selected subset of the search result entries, and displaying the summary document (See col. 8, lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 61, Kravets discloses the network comprises the Internet (See col. 4, line 32), and the site comprises a search engine at a remote World Wide Web site (See col. 4, line 32).

Regarding claim 62, Kravets discloses the network comprises the Internet (See col. 4, line 32), the method further comprising transmitting the initial search query to a plurality of search engines at remote World Wide Web sites (See col. 4, lines 23-30) and receiving a plurality of search result documents from the search engines in response to the initial search query, each search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22, Kravets et al.).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 26-55 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: After reviewing the Applicant arguments in the Appeal brief dated 10/09/2007, the claims 26-55 are allowed over Haitsuka and Davis references.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/09/2007 about the claim rejection of the last Office Action have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

¹ Please note that hypertext link itself broadly describe the associated document, therefore parsing the hypertext

Art Unit: 2163

Applicant argues that Kravets fails to teach any kind of filtering the search result entries based on information in accessed pages. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Col. 7, line 61 to col. 8, line 16 teaches filtering the search result entries based on information in accessed pages. Kravets discloses restricting search result ("set of URLs") to pages that visited last week. This clearly teaches Applicants claimed limitation of filtering based on information of the accessed pages.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4026. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.


MN

January 07, 2008


DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

links also the same as parsing descriptions.